

Creation Ministries Int'l, Ltd., 556 F.3d 459, 465 (6th Cir. 2009) (“[F]ederal courts have a duty to consider their subject matter jurisdiction in regard to every case and may raise the issue sua sponte.”) (citations omitted).

The Court also put Plaintiff on notice that if his complaint was found to be frivolous, the Court may issue sanctions to deter him from continuing to file frivolous and meritless motions and pleadings. (Doc. 9.) “A court may exercise its inherent power to sanction when a party has ‘acted in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons,’ or when the conduct was ‘tantamount to bad faith.’” *United States v. Aleo*, 681 F.3d 290, 305 (6th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Metz v. Unizan Bank*, 655 F.3d 485, 489 (6th Cir. 2011)). To prevent these repeated frivolous filings, courts have sanctioned individual litigants to protect the fair and efficient administration of justice for those parties pursuing legitimate claims. *See United States v. Lewis*, 411 F.3d 838, 844 (7th Cir. 2005) (noting at times courts must resort to monetary sanctions or filing bars to restrain abusive litigants); *Support Sys. Int'l v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995) (ordering clerk of court to return any papers defendant attempted to file in all civil actions until he paid sanctions entered against him for filing numerous frivolous and fraudulent filings); *Alexander v. United States*, 121 F.3d 312, 315 (7th Cir. 1997) (entered order addressing prisoner’s repeated filing of civil actions and successive collateral attacks on the basis of the Supreme Court’s holding in *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32 (1991), that courts have inherent powers to protect themselves from vexatious litigation).

In light of Plaintiff’s pro se status, the Court will warn him one final time: Plaintiff cannot refile the same complaint and hope for a different result. It is a waste of the resources of the Court, the Defendant, and, indeed, Plaintiff himself. The proper course of action would be to appeal the Court’s decision, which Plaintiff has now done. (See Docs. 49, 50 in Case No. 1:24-

cv-66.) If Plaintiff continues to refile the same complaint, the Court may issue sanctions, including a limited injunction, to deter him.

For the reasons stated above, Plaintiff's claims (Doc. 1) are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Because there no claims remaining, Defendant's motion for an extension of time to answer (Doc. 11) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

AN APPROPRIATE JUDGMENT SHALL ENTER.

/s/ Travis R. McDonough

TRAVIS R. MCDONOUGH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE